

3.4c
OBSERVATIONS
AND
CONJECTURES
UPON
SOME PASSAGES
OF
SHAKESPEARE.

OXFORD,

At the CLARENDON PRESS. MDCCCLXVI.

Sold by DAN. PRINCE, at OXFORD; by J. RIVINGTON,
in St. Paul's Church-yard, and T. PAYNE, next the
Mews-Gate, St. Martin's, LONDON.

ERRATA.

Page 11, l. 17, for Gorgan, read Gorgon. P. 16,
l. 2, for enumerated, r. enumerated. P. 17, l.
10, for Yon, r. Yea. P. 18, l. 7, for Scene
i. r. Scene 11. P. 20, l. 7, for care, r. cure.
P. 21, l. 23, for Crepida, r. Creffida. P. 23.
l. 12, for Scene i. r. Scene 4. P. 24, l. 9, for
Dr. W. proposes to read word, r. ward.



XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

OBSERVATIONS, &c.

upon some Passages of

SHAKESPEARE.

THE publication of Mr. *Johnson's* long-expected Edition of *Shakespeare's* Plays threw a temptation in my way, which I had no desire to resist, of looking over once more the enchanting scenes of that admirable Poet. As I had formerly read Him, with more attention to his text, than is usually given to the works of a modern Author, I had some curiosity to see how far my conjectures upon certain passages would be approved and confirmed by the judgment of Mr. *Johnson*; and I was not without hopes that other passages of which I had despaired, might still be restored by the happier efforts of a more penetrating acuteness, with the assistance of the old
B copies.

copies. I confess freely that my vanity has not been gratified with many instances of the first sort; and of the latter, I think, the instances are indeed very few. However, I do not mean to enter into the merits of Mr. *Johnson's* performance. Be they what they are. My intention is merely to set down my own observations and conjectures upon some passages of *Shakespeare*, which have either been passed over in silence, or attempted, in my opinion, without success, by former Commentators.

As I do not mean to confine myself to any method, I shall begin with the Play, which stands last in Mr. *Johnson's* Edition, and which therefore is freshest in my memory.

There is a passage not far from the beginning of *OTHELLO*, upon which various Criticks have exercised their wits, but, it should seem, with little success; as, after all, Mr. *Johnson* declares, that it “ must, for the present, be resigned to corruption and obscurity.” In such a case, where the regular Physician has absolutely given the Patient over, it may be allowable for a mere Quack to try his skill, or rather his fortune. The passage is this :

One *Michael Cassio*, a *Florentine*,
A fellow almost damn'd in a fair WIFE.

The

The great difficulty is to understand in what sense any man can be said to be *almost damn'd in a fair wife*; or *fair phyz*, as Sir T. Hanmer proposes to read. I cannot find any ground for supposing that either the one or the other have ever been reputed to be damnable sins in any religion. The Poet has used the same mode of expression in the *Merchant of Venice*. Act i. Scene 1.

O my *Anthony*, I do know of those
 Who therefore only are reputed wife,
 For saying nothing; who, I'm very sure,
 If they should speak, would *almost damn* those
 ears,
 Which, hearing them, would call their brothers
 fools.

And there, the allusion is evident to the Gospel-judgment against those, who call their brothers fools. I am therefore inclined to believe, that the true reading here, is,

A fellow almost damn'd in a fair LIFE;
 and that *Shakespeare* alludes to the judgment denounced in the Gospel against those *of whom all men speak well*.

The character of *Cassio* is certainly such, as would be very likely to draw upon him all the peril of

this denunciation, literally understood. Well-bred, easy, sociable, good-natured; with abilities enough to make him agreeable and useful, but not sufficient to excite the envy of his equals, or to alarm the jealousy of his superiors. It may be observed too, that *Shakespeare* has thought it proper to make *Iago*, in several other passages, bear his testimony to the amiable qualities of his rival. In Act v. Scene 1, he speaks thus of him :

————— If *Cassio* do remain,
He hath a *daily beauty in his life*,
That makes me ugly. —————

I will only add, that, however hard or far-fetch'd this allusion (whether *Shakespeare's*, or only mine) may seem to be, Archbishop *Skeldon* had exactly the same conceit, when he made that singular compliment, as the Writer calls it *, to a nephew of Sir *William Temple*, that *he had the curse of the Gospel, because all men spoke well of him*.

Before I leave *OTHELLO*, I will say a few words upon a passage, which has been as amply discussed as the last, and, in my opinion, to as little purpose.

* Biog. Britan. Art. TEMPLE.

In Act i. Scene 9. *Othello*, when he is desiring that *Desdemona* may go with him, says,

—— I therefore beg it not
To please the palate of my appetite ;
Nor to comply with heat, the young affects,
In my defunct and proper satisfaction ;
But to be free and bounteous to her mind.

If I could persuade the Reader, as I am almost persuaded myself, that the two last lines have by some accident changed places, and that the passage ought to be read thus :

—— I therefore beg it not,
To please the palate of my appetite,
Nor to comply with heat, the young affects ;
But to be free and bounteous to her mind,
In my defunct and proper satisfaction.

I would then recommend it to consideration, whether the word *defunct* (which would be the only remaining difficulty) is not capable of a signification, drawn from the primitive sense of its *Latin* original, which would very well agree with the context.

Having just dropped this hint, I will go on to propose my conjectures upon some other passages with less hesitation.

In

In the concluding Scene of CYMBELINE, *Belarius* says of himself,

———— He it is, that hath
Assum'd this AGE. ———

As there is no reason to imagine that *Belarius* had assumed the appearance of being older than he really was, I suspect that, instead of AGE, we ought to read GAGE; so that he may be understood to refer to *the engagement*, which he had entered into, a few lines before, in these words:

———— We will die all three,
But I will prove that two on 's are as good
As I have given out Him. ———

This Play is opened by a Gentleman of *Cymbeline's* Court, with the following lines:

You do not meet a man but frowns: Our
 bloods
No more obey the heavens than our Courtiers;
Still seem, as does the KING's.

Mr. *Johnson* pronounces "this passage to be so
" difficult, that Commentators may differ concern-
" ing it without animosity, or shame." He then
rejects the emendations proposed by Dr. *Warburton*
and Sir *T. Hanmer*, and gives the following "Pa-
" raphrase,

“ raphrase, which, he thinks, will render emenda-
 “ tion unnecessary.”

“ *We do not meet a man but frowns ; our bloods*
 “ — our countenances, which, in popular speech,
 “ are said to be regulated by the temper of the
 “ blood, — *no more obey the laws of heaven,*
 “ — which directs us to appear what we really
 “ are, — *than our Courtiers’ ;* ——— that is,
 “ *than the bloods of our Courtiers ;* but our bloods,
 “ like theirs — *still seem as doth the King’s.*”

If there should by chance be any man, who, after having read this Paraphrase, still finds the passage obscure ; to him, and him only, I would propose a method of making it clear by a very slight alteration, only leaving out the last letter.

You do not meet a man but frowns ; our
 bloods

No more obey the heavens than our Courtiers
 Still seem, as does the KING. ———

That is, *Still look as the King does ;* or, as he expresses it a little differently afterwards,

———— *wear their faces to the bent*
Of the King’s look. ———

In

In Act i. Scene 8. *Iachimo* says,

Sluttery, to such neat excellence oppos'd
Should make desire vomit emptiness,
Not so ALLUR'D to feed. ———

Dr. *Warburton* and Mr. *Johnson* have both taken the pains to give their different senses of this passage; but I am still unable to comprehend, how Desire, or any other thing, can be made *to vomit emptiness*. I rather believe the passage should be read thus.

Sluttery, to such neat excellence oppos'd,
Should make desire vomit, emptiness
Not so ALLURE to feed. ———

That is, Should *not so*, [in such circumstances] *allure* [even] *emptiness to feed*.

A similar error, I believe, has crept into the dialogue between *Cleopatra* and *Enobarbus*, in ANTHONY AND CLEOPATRA. Act iii. Scene 6.

Cleo. Thou hast forespoke my being in these wars;
And say'st, It is not fit.

Enob. Well; is it, is it?

Cleo. Is't not DENOUNC'D against us? why should not we
Be there in person?

I would read :

Is't not? DENOUNCE against us, why should
not we

Be there in person? ———

In the next Scene, *Scarus*, speaking of *Cleopatra*,
calls her,

——— Yon ribauld NAG of *Egypt*.

I believe we should read, HAG. What follows
seems to prove it :

——— She once being looft,
The noble ruin of her *magick*, *Anthony*,
Claps on his sea-wing. ———

In the ninth Scene of the same Act. *Cleopatra*
says to *Enobarbus*,

What shall we do, *Enobarbus*?

To which he replies,

——— THINK and die.

Sir T. Hanmer reads, — *Drink* and die. — And
his emendation has been approved, it seems, by Dr.
Warburton and Mr. *Upton*. Mr. *Johnson*, however,
“ has not advanced it into the page, not being con-
“ vinced that it is necessary. *Think and die* ;” says

he, "that is, *Reflect on your own folly, and leave the world,* is a natural answer." I grant it would be, according to this explanation, a very proper answer from a Moralist or a Divine; but *Enobarbus*, I doubt, was neither the one nor the other. He is drawn as a *plain, blunt Soldier*; not likely, however, to offend so grossly in point of delicacy as Sir *T. Hanmer*'s alteration would make him. I believe the true reading is,

——— WINK and die.

When the ship is going to be cast away, in the *Seavoyage* of *Beaumont* and *Fletcher*, (Act i. Scene 1.) and *Aminta* is lamenting, *Tibalt* says to her,

————— Go, take your guilt

Prayer-book, and to your business; *wink and die*:

insinuating plainly, that she was afraid to meet death with her eyes open. And the same insinuation, I think, *Enobarbus* might very naturally convey in his return to *Cleopatra*'s desponding question.

I have observed two passages in Act ii. Scene 5. of this Play, which, I think, stand in need of correction: In the first indeed the sense suffers very much for want of it.

Cleopatra

Cleopatra says to the Messenger,

I have a mind to strike thee ere thou speak'st ;
 Yet, if thou say *Anthony* lives, 'TIS WELL,
 Or friends with *Cæsar*, or not captive to him,
 I'll set thee in a shower of gold, and hail
 Rich pearls upon thee. ———

We should surely read, IS WELL. The Messenger is to have his reward, if he says, that *Anthony* is alive, in health, and either friends with *Cæsar*, or not captive to him.

In the other passage the sense is clear, but, I think, may be much improved by a very little alteration.

Cleopatra, in her passion upon the news of *Anthony's* marriage, says,

Let him for ever go — let him NOT — *Char-*
mion, ———

Though he be painted one way like a *Gorgan*,
 Th' other way he's a *Mars*. ———

This, I think, would be more spirited thus,

Let him for ever go — let him — NO, — *Char-*
mion ;

Though he be painted, &c.

This reminds me of a passage in CYMBELINE, (Act iii. Scene 2.) which, I think, would be improved by a like alteration. *Imogen*, upon receiving *Posthumus's* letter, makes the following prayer.

————— You good Gods,
 Let what is here contain'd relish of love,
 Of my Lord's health, of his content;— yet NOT,
 That we two are asunder; — let that grieve
 him!
 Some griefs are medicinable; that is one of them,
 For it doth physick love; — of his content,
 All but in that. —————

I should wish to read,

————— Yet NO;
 That we two are asunder, let that grieve him!

At the bottom of this page, there is a long note of Mr. *Johnson's*, with some conjectures; all which, I believe, he would have spared, if he had observed, that the reading of the *Folio* Edition 1632, is [not *forfeitures*, but] *forfeitours*, that is, *persons forfeiting*. Collating is certainly dull work; but I doubt whether, upon the whole, an Editor would not find it the shortest and easiest, as well as the surest, method of discharging his duty.

The

The reading of the old Copies, though corrupt, is generally nearer to the truth than that of the later Editions, which, for the most part, adopt the orthography of their respective ages. An instance occurs in the Play of CYMBELINE, in the last Scene, *Belarius* says to the King,

Your pleasure was my NEAR offence, my
punishment

Itself, and all my treason. —

Mr. *Johnson* would read, *dear* offence. In the *Folio* it is, *neere*; which plainly points out to us the true reading, MEERE, as the word was then spelt.

In the celebrated speech of *Mercutio*, [ROMEO AND JULIET, Act i. Scene 5.] he describes Queen *Mab* as galloping,

On COURTIERs' knees, that dream on curt'sies
strait;

O'er Lawyers fingers, who strait dream on fees.

And then goes on,

Sometimes she gallops o'er a Courtier's nose,

And then dreams He of smelling out a suit;—

In the latter lines, Dr. *Warburton* has very justly restored the old reading, *Courtier's nose*, which had
been

been changed into *Lawyer's nose*, by some Editor, who did not know, as it should seem, of any *suits*, but *law-suits*. Dr. Warburton has explained the passage with his usual learning; but I do not think he is so happy in his endeavour to justify *Shakespeare* from the charge of a *vicious repetition*, in introducing the *Courtier* twice. The second *Folio*, I observe, reads,

On COUNTRIES knees: ———

which has led me to conjecture, that the line ought to be read thus:

On COUNTIES knees, that dream on courties
strait; ———

Counties I understand to signify *noblemen*, in general. *Paris*, who, in one place, I think, is called *Earl*, is most commonly stiled the *Countie* in this Play. *Shakespeare* seems to have preferred, for some reason or other, the Italian *Conte* to our *Count*. It was no permanent reason, for I do not recollect that he uses the title in other plays, where the scene is in Italy. Perhaps he took it from the old *English* Novel, from which he is said to have taken his Plot.

But the old Copies do not only assist us to find the true reading by conjecture. I will give an instance, from the second *Folio*, of a reading (incontestably the true one) which has escaped the laborious

ous

ous researches of the many most diligent Criticks, who have favoured the world with Editions of *Shakespeare*, from *Theobald* to Mr. *Johnson*. In *TITUS ANDRONICUS*, Act iv. Scene 1. *Marcus* says,

My Lord, kneel down with me; *Lavinia*,
kneel;

And kneel, sweet boy, the *Roman Hero's* hope;
And swear with me, as, with the woeful *Peer*,
And father of that chaste dishonour'd dame,
Lord *Junius Brutus* sware for *Lucrece's* rape. —

What meaning has hitherto been annexed to the word *Peer*, in this passage, I know not. The reading of the second Folio is, *FEERE*, which signifies a *companion*, and here, metaphorically, a *husband*. The proceeding of *Brutus*, which is alluded to, is described at length in our Author's *Rape of Lucrece*, as putting an end to the lamentations of *Collatinus* and *Lucretius*, the husband and father of *Lucretia*.

As I shall hardly have occasion to mention this Play of *Titus Andronicus* again, I will take this opportunity of producing an authority for ascribing it to *Shakespeare*, which I think a decisive one, though not made use of, as I remember, by any of his Commentators. It is given to him, among other Plays, which are undoubtedly his, in a little book, called, *Palladis Tamia, or, the second Part of Wit's Commonwealth*,

monwealth, written by — *Maister*, and printed at *London* in 1598. The other Tragedies, enumerated as his in that book, are, *King John*, *Richard the second*, *Henry the fourth*, *Richard the third*, and *Romeo and Juliet*. The Comedies are, *The Midsummer Night's Dream*, the *Gentlemen of Verona*, the *Errors*, the *Love's labour lost*, the *Love's labour won*, and the *Merchant of Venice*. I have given this list, as it serves so far to ascertain the date of these Plays; and also, as it contains a notice of a Comedy of *Shakespeare*, the *Love's labour won*, not included in any collection of his works; nor, as far as I know, attributed to him by any other authority. If there should be a Play in being, with that title, though without *Shakespeare's* name, I should be glad to see it; and I think the Editor would be sure of the publick thanks, even if it should prove no better than the *Love's labour lost*.

But, to return to my Conjectures. In *CORIO- LANUS*, Act i. Scene 2. in the fable of the Belly and the Members, which *Menenius* tells so humourously, he makes the Belly, after having acknowledged that he receives *the general food at first*, go on thus.

—— But, if you do remember,
I fend it through the rivers of your blood,
Even to the Court, the Heart, TO TH' SEAT
O' TH' BRAIN.

He

This last expreffion feems to me very languid. I believe it is not *Shakespeare's*, and that we fhould read, with the omiffion of a particle,

Even to the Court, the Heart, TO THE SEAT,
THE BRAIN.

He uſes *Seat* for *Throne*, the *Royal Seat*; which the firſt Editors probably not apprehending, corrupted the paſſage. It is thus uſed in *Richard the ſecond*, Act iii. Scene 4.

Yon diſtaff-women manage ruſty Bills
Againſt thy *Seat*. —————

It ſhould be obſerved too, that one of the Citizens had juſt before characteriſed theſe principal parts of the human fabrick by ſimilar metaphors,

The *kingly-crowned Head*, the vigilant Eye,
The *Counſellor Heart*.

This corruption is not unlike one which I think I have obſerved in *MACBETH*, Act iii. Scene 3. *Macbeth* ſays to the two murderers,

————— In this hour at moſt
I will adviſe you where to plant yourſelves;
Acquaint you with the perfect SPY O' TH' time
The moment on't; for 't muſt be done to night
And ſomething from the palace. ———

D

Mr.

Mr. *Johnson* finding this passage "difficult" (he might have said impossible) "to be explained, as "it stands at present," has proposed to gain sense by a slight alteration; viz. by reading, in verse the third,

————— A perfect spy o' th' time.

The alteration is certainly a slight one, but whether any sense is gained by it, I much doubt. I rather believe we should read thus:

Acquaint you with the perfect SPOT, THE time,
The moment on't; —————

In Act i. Scene i. of *CORIOLANUS*, he speaks thus;

————— When drums and trumpets shall
I' th' field prove flatterers, let courts and cities
Be made all of false-fac'd soothing! when steel
grows

Soft as the Parasite's silk, let HIM be made
An OVERTURE for the wars! —————

The first part of the passage has been altered, in my opinion, unnecessarily by Dr. *Warburton*; and the latter not so happily, I think, as he often conjectures. However, both his alterations have had the good luck to be admitted into Mr. *Johnson*'s text of *Shakespeare*. In the latter part, which only I mean to consider, instead of, *him*, (an evident corruption) he substitutes, *hymns*; which perhaps may palliate,

palliate, but certainly has not cured, the wounds of the sentence. I would propose an alteration of two words.

When steel grows
Soft as the Parasite's filk, let THIS [i. e. filk] be
made
A COVERTURE for the wars!

The sense will then be apt and complete. *When steel grows soft as filk, let armour be made of filk instead of steel.*

The mistake of *overture*, for *coverture*, has been made in Act iii. Scene 3. of the *third part of Henry the sixth*, at least in Mr. *Johnson's* Edition; and he has well corrected it in a note. To the arguments, which he has there used in support of his conjecture, I will add, that *coverture* is actually the reading of the only two Editions, which I have, the second *Folio*, and *Theobald's*. It should seem by this, that not only *the laborious Collator*, as Mr. *Johnson* expresses it in his Preface, but also the negligent Collator *at some unlucky moment frolicks in conjecture*.

The expression is indeed a happy one; for conjectural Criticism is properly a frolick of the understanding. It is pleasant enough to the Critick himself, and may serve to amuse a few readers; as long as it only professes to amuse. When it pretends to

any thing higher ; when it assumes an air of gravity and importance, a decisive and dictatorial tone ; the acute Conjecturer becomes an object of pity, the stupid one of contempt.

In TIMON, Act iii. Scene 3. is the following passage.

————— His friends, like Physicians,
THRIVE give him over, must I take the care up-
on me ?

The common Editions have, *Thriv'd*, but Mr. Johnson says that it is *Thrive*, in the original. As neither reading will make a tolerable sense, Mr. Pope has proposed to substitute *three* ; Sir T. Hammer, *try'd* ; and Mr. Johnson seems more inclined to, *thrice*. Perhaps we should read SHRIV'D. They give him over *shriv'd* ; that is, *prepared for immediate death by shrift*.

In Act iv. Scene 4. *Timon*, in his instructions to *Alcibiades*, says,

————— Let not the Virgin's cheek
Make soft thy trenchant sword ; FOR those milk-
paps,
That through the WINDOW BARN bore at mens
eyes,

Are

Are not within the leaf of pity writ ;

Set them down horrible traitors. —————

Dr. Warburton had conjectured very ingeniously, that *Shakespeare* wrote — *window-lawn*. Mr. Johnson thinks “ the reading is more probably, *window-bars*. The Virgin that shows her bosom through “ the lattice of her chamber.” I wonder he did not add, that *Shakespeare* took the idea from a picture of the *Roman Charity*, where, if I remember, the daughter does shew her *milk-paps* through the *window-bars* of the prison. For my own part, I cannot help suspecting that the corruption has gone farther than either of these gentlemen seems to imagine. I think *Shakespeare* would not have chosen to give *milk-paps* to a *Virgin*. In short, I believe we should read nearly thus.

————— Nor those milk-paps,

That through the WIDOWS BARB bore at mens
eyes,

Are not within the leaf of pity writ.

The use of the doubled negative is so common in *Shakespeare*, that it is unnecessary to support it by instances. The *barbe*, I believe, was a kind of veil. *Crepida*, in *Chaucer*, who appears as a Widow, is described as wearing a *barbe*. T. and C. Book ii. verse 110. in which place *Caxton's* Edition, as I learn from the Glossary, reads *wimple*, which certainly

tainly signifies a *veil*, and was probably substituted as a synonymous word for *barbe*, the more antiquated reading of the Manuscripts. *Unbarbed* is used by *Shakespeare* for *uncovered*, in *Coriolanus*, Act iii. Scene 5.

Must I go shew them my *unbarbed* sconce?

In Act ii. Scene 2. of this Play there is an expression, which I shall take notice of principally on account of Mr. *Johnson's* note. One of the Servants, who are waiting for *Timon*, says to another,

—— Good even, *Varro*.

Upon which Mr. *Johnson* has the following note.

“ It is observable that this *good evening* is before dinner; for *Timon* tells *Alcibiades*, that
 “ they will go forth again as soon as dinner's done,
 “ which may prove that by *dinner*, our authour
 “ meant not the *cæna* of ancient times, but the
 “ mid-day's repast. I do not suppose the passage corrupt: such inadvertencies neither authour nor editor can escape.”

As to Editors, I have nothing to say to them; though I think their being liable to inadvertency is introduced very oddly as a reason for supposing this passage *not* corrupt. The author, I verily believe,
 has

has been guilty of no inadvertency here. *Good even*, or, as it is sometimes less accurately written, *Good den*, was the usual salutation from *noon*, the moment that *Good morrow* became improper. This appears plainly from the following passage. *Romeo and Juliet*, Act ii. Scene 4.

Nurse. God ye good morrow, Gentlemen.

Mercutio. God ye *good den*, fair Gentlewoman.

Nur. Is it *good den*?

Merc. 'Tis no less I tell you; for the hand of the dial is now upon *noon*.

So in *Hamlet's* greeting to *Marcellus*. Act i. Scene 1. Sir T. Hanmer and Dr. Warburton, not being aware, I presume, of this wide sense of *Good even*, have altered it to *Good morning*; without any necessity, as from the course of the incidents, precedent and subsequent, the day may well be supposed to be turn'd of *noon*. Mr. Johnson who, upon occasion of the passage in *Timon*, had only laid claim to our indulgence for the human inadvertencies of his author, here undertakes his defence, but still very oddly, by saying, that *it may as well be evening as morning*.

* Being thus brought back to HAMLET, I will just take notice of a passage which has been universally given up as corrupt by the Commentators. In
Act

Act iv. Scene 6. the Messenger speaking of *Laertes* to the King, says,

—— The rabble call him Lord,
And as the world were now but to begin,
Antiquity forgot, custom not known,
The ratifiers and props of every *word*,
They cry, “ Chuse we *Laertes* for our King.”

Sir T. Hanmer would transpose the two last lines. Dr. Warburton proposes to read, *word*; and Mr. Johnson, *weal*, instead of *word*. I should be rather for reading, *work*.

The same monosyllable, I believe, has suffered a different corruption in HENRY THE EIGHTH, Act ii. Scene 6. Queen Catherine says to *Wolfey*,

You have by fortune and his Highness' favours,
Gone slightly o'er low steps, and now are
mounted

Where Powers are your retainers; and your
WORDS,

Domesticks to you, serve your will, as 't please
Yourself pronounce their office. ——

The latter part of this sentence is unintelligible to me, even after Mr. Johnson's explanation of it. I believe we should read,

Where

Where Powers are your retainers, and your
WARDS,
Domesticks to you, &c.

The Queen rises naturally in her description. She paints the Powers of Government depending upon *Wolsey*, under three images; as his *retainers*, his *wards*, his *domestick servants*.

Mr. *Johnson* has bestowed a Note, in his *Appendix*, upon a passage in the *First Part of Henry the sixth*, (Act i. Scene 8.) which, he says, “ he did “ not know till of late had been thought difficult.”

The Prince’s ’spials have informed me,
The *English*, in the suburbs close intrench’d,
WENT through a secret grate of iron bars,
In yonder tower, to over-peer the city; —

I believe the difficulty will be better removed, if, instead of *Went*, we read WONT, the third person plural of the old verb *wont*. *The English — wont*, that is, *are accustomed to overpeer the city*. The word is used most frequently by *Spenser*, and several times by *Milton*.

In the Chorus to the fourth Act of HENRY THE FIFTH, is the following passage.

E

The

The country cocks do crow, the clocks do
toll,
And (the third hour of drowsy morning NAM'D)
Proud of their numbers, and secure in soul,
The confident, and over lusty *French*,
Do the low-rated *English* play at dice ; —

I believe every reader of taste must be hurt by that heavy Parenthesis in the second line. How much better might we read thus ?

The country cocks do crow, the clocks do
toll,
And the third hour of drowsy morning NAME.

Then begin another sentence.

There is another parenthesis in the concluding scene of the WINTER'S TALE, which has always greatly disgusted me. *Paulina*, seeing *Leontes* so much moved, says,

————— Indeed, my Lord,
If I had thought the sight of my poor image
Would thus have wrought you (*for the stone is
mine*)
I'd not have shew'd it. ———

I do not know whether we should not read, without a parenthesis,

————— *For*

————— *For the stone i' th' mine*

I'd not have shew'd it. —————

A *mine* of *stone*, or *marble*, would not perhaps at present be esteemed an accurate expression, but it may still have been used by *Shakespeare*.

While the Confederates are listening to *Malvolio's* soliloquy, [TWELFTH NIGHT, Act ii. Scene 8.] *Fabian* says,

————— Though our silence be drawn from us
with CARES, yet, peace. —————

Mr. *Johnson* thinks the true reading is, *carts*: — but surely *carts* are more proper *to be drawn themselves*, than *to draw with*. If I was to suggest a word in the place of *cares*, (which I think is a corruption) it should be, *cables*; and I would support my conjecture by the two very passages which Mr. *Johnson* has quoted in confirmation of his own.

It may be worth remarking, perhaps, that the leading ideas of *Malvolio*, in his *humour of state*, bear a strong resemblance to those of *Alnaschar*, in the *Arabian Nights Entertainments*. Some of the expressions too are very similar.

I go back to the *ALL'S WELL THAT ENDS WELL*, in which, I think, I have observed a few corruptions, which may be easily rectified.

Act i. Scene 3. *Parolles* speaks.

It is not politick in the commonwealth of nature, to preserve virginity. Loss of virginity is *RATIONAL* increase ; and there was never virgin got, till virginity was first lost. —

I believe we should read, *NATIONAL*.

Scene 6. in the dialogue between the *Countess* and the *Clown*.

Clo. I am out of friends, Madam, and I hope to have friends for my wife's sake.

Count. Such friends are thine enemies, knave.

Clo. Y' are shallow, Madam, in great friends, for the knaves come to do that for me which I am weary of ; —

This last speech, I think, should be read thus,

Y' are shallow, Madam ; my great friends ;—

Act ii. Scene 5.

Lafew. I may truly say, it is a novelty to the world.

Parolles.

Parolles. It is, indeed, if you will have it IN shewing, you shall read it in, what do you call there ———

Laf. A shewing of a heavenly effect in an earthly actor.

This answer of *Lafeu* points out to us the true reading of *Parolles's* speech.

It is, indeed, if you will have it, A shewing ——— you shall read it in, what do you call there ———

Act iv. Scene 3. *Lafeu* calls the *Clown*, a shrewd knave and an unhappy. Upon which the *Countess* says,

So he is. My Lord, that's gone, made himself much sport out of him; by his authority he remains here, which he thinks is a patent for his fauciness; and, indeed, he has no PACE, but runs where he will. ———

Should not we read, no PLACE, that is, no *station*, or *office* in the family?

In the MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING, Act v. Scene 1. *Leonato* says,

If

If such a one will smile and stroke his beard,
And sorrow, WAGGE, crie hem, when he should
groan, —

Mr. *Theobald* reads, *sorrow wage* ; and explains it to mean, *combat with, strive against* sorrow. Sir *T. Hanmer* and Dr. *Warburton* read *sorrow waive*. Mr. *Johnson*, not satisfied with either of these conjectures, proposes to rectifie the passage by a new punctuation only. “ I point thus,” says he,

If such an one will smile and stroke his beard,
And, sorrow wag ! cry ; hem, when he should
groan ;

“ That is, (as he explains it) *If he will smile and*
“ *cry sorrow be gone, and hem instead of groaning.*”
I think we might read,

And sorrow GAGGE ; cry hem, when he should
groan ; —

But, leaving this conjecture to shift for itself, I will say a few words upon the phrase, *cry hem*. It is used again by our Author, in the *First Part of Henry the fourth*, Act ii. Scene 7.

—— They call drinking deep, dying scarlet ;
and when you breathe in your watering, they cry
hem, and bid you play it off. ——

In

In both places *to cry hem* seems to signifie the same as *to cry courage* ; in which sense the interjection *hem* was also sometimes used by the *Latins*. Is it not therefore probable, that this plain and natural expression is the true original of that other less intelligible and seemingly more refined phrase, *cry aim*, which is used by *Shakespeare* in exactly the same sense, and of which neither *Dr. Warburton* nor *Mr. Johnson* have been able to give any satisfactory Etymology ? See *Dr. Warburton's* Note upon the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, Act ii. Scene 1. and *Mr. Johnson's* upon *King John*, Act ii. Scene 2. The phrases of common use in familiar discourse are apt to be strangely disguised when they make their appearance upon paper.

One of these vulgarisms (if I may so call them) being ill expressed by the Printer, has totally obscured the following passage in the *TEMPEST*, Act ii. Scene 1.

Sebastian. ——— What stuff is this ? how say you ?

'Tis true, my brother's daughter's Queen of
Tunis,

So is she heir of *Naples* ; 'twixt which regions
There is some space.

Antonio. A space whose every cubit
Seems to cry out, how shall that *Claribel*

Measure

Measure us back *by* *Naples*? keep in *Tunis*.

And let *Sebastian* wake. ———

This is the old reading, which the later Editors not understanding, have, by a general consent, changed *by* into *to*. A less alteration, I believe, will make the passage clear. I suppose it ought to be written thus.

————— How shall that *Claribel*

Measure us back? *B'w'y*, *Naples*; keep in *Tunis*;

And let *Sebastian* wake. —————

B'w'y is a common corruption, in conversation, of *good b'w'y*, which itself is a corruption, I presume, of *good be with you*, a phrase, as every one knows, equivalent to *farewell*.

The spirited turn which this reading gives to the passage is well suited, I think, to the character and situation of *Anthonio*, and may serve in some degree to compensate for the meanness of the expression.

In the MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM, Act iii.
Scene 6. *Helena* says to *Demetrius* and *Lysander*,

Can you not hate me, as I know you do,
But you must join in souls to mock me too?

Mr. *Johnson's* note upon this passage is, " This is
" surely wrong. We may read, *Join in scorns*, or
" *join*

"*join in scoffs.*" I agree with him that there is a fault, but I do not think it lies in the word which he proposes to alter.

I rather believe the line should be read thus,

But you must join, *ILL* souls, to mock me too?

Ill is often used for *bad*, *wicked*. So in the *Sea-voyage of Beaumont and Fletcher*, Act v. Scene 1.

They did begin to quarrel, like *ill* men.

Which I cite the rather, because *ill* had there also been changed into *in*, by an error of the Press, which Mr. *Sympson* has corrected from the Edition 1647.

In the same Play, Act ii. Scene 2. are these lines.

The human mortals want their winter *HERE*,
No night is now with hymn or carol blest.

I long ago conjectured that we ought to read *CHEER*, [according to the old spelling, *cheere*,] which, without departing much from the present text, will make the passage very good sense. I learn since, from the *Revisal of Shakespeare's text*, that Sir T. *Hammer* has made the same correction. Mr. *Johnson* however, who, in his Preface, professes to have received ALL Sir Thomas's notes, makes no
F mention

mention of this. It is *possible*, indeed, that he may have overlooked it, with all his attention and accuracy.

The second *Folio*, I observe, reads *beere*.

In the sixth Scene of the same Act, *Lysander* says to *Hermia*:

O take the sense, sweet, of my innocence;
LOVE TAKES the meaning in love's conference.

The latter line is certainly intelligible as Mr. *Johnson* has explained it; but, I think, it requires a slight alteration to make it connect well with the former. I would read,

LOVE TAKE the meaning in love's conference.

That is, Let *love take the meaning*. ———

In the dialogue between the *Duke* and *Juliet*, in the MEASURE FOR MEASURE, Act ii. Scene 9. the *Duke* says to her, upon her declaring that she repented,

'Tis meet so, daughter; but least you do re-
pent
As that the sin hath brought you to this shame;
Which

Which sorrow is always toward ourselves, not
heaven ;

Shewing we would not spare heaven, as we love
it,

But as we stand in fear.

Jul. I do repent me, *as it is an evil,*
And take the shame with joy.

I have given this passage from the second *Folio*, as I do not know upon what authority the variations in the latter Editions have been admitted. It is plain, I think, that a line, at least, is wanting after the first of the *Duke's* speech. It would be presumptuous to attempt to replace the words ; but the sense, I am persuaded, is easily recoverable out of *Juliet's* answer. I suppose his advice, in substance, to have been nearly this. Take care, *least you repent* [not so much of your fault, *as it is an evil,*] *as that the sin hath brought you to this shame.* Accordingly, *Juliet's* answer is explicit to this point.

I do repent me, as it is an evil,
And take the shame with joy.

In the next Scene, *Angelo* makes the following comparisons.

So play the foolish throngs with one that swoons;
 Come all to help him, and so stop the air
 By which he should revive: and even so
 The general subject to a well-wish'd King
 Quit their own part, and in obsequious fondness
 Crowd to his presence, where their untaught
 love

Must needs appear offence. ———

The *Duke* had before [Act i. Scene 2.] expressed
 his dislike of popular applause.

I'll privily away. I love the people,
 But do not like to stage me to their eyes.
 Though it do well, I do not relish well
 Their loud applause, and *ave's* vehement:
 Nor do I think the man of safe discretion,
 That does affect it. ———

I cannot help thinking that *Shakespeare*, in these
 two passages intended to flatter that unkingly weak-
 ness of *James the first*, which made him so impatient
 of the crowds that flocked to see him, especially
 upon his first coming, that, as some of our Histo-
 rians say, he restrained them by a Proclamation.
 Sir *Symonds D'Ewes*, in his *Memoirs of his own*
*Life**, has a remarkable passage with regard to this

* A Manuscript in the *British Museum*.

humour of *James*. After taking notice, that the King going to Parliament, on the 30th of *January*, 1620-1, "spake lovingly to the people, and said, "God bleſs ye, God bleſs ye;" he adds theſe words, "contrary to his former haſty and paſſionate cuſtom, "which often, in his ſudden diſtemper, would bid a "pox or a plague on ſuch as flock'd to ſee him."

Act iv. Scene 6. of the ſame Play.

Duke. Have you no countermand for *Claudio* yet,

But he muſt die to-morrow ?

Provost. None, Sir, none.

Duke. As near the dawning, *Provost*, as it is,
You ſhall hear more ere morning.

Prov. Happily

You ſomething know ; yet, I believe, there
comes

No countermand ; no ſuch example have we :

Besides, upon the very ſiege of juſtice

Lord *Angelo* hath to the publick ear

Profeſt the contrary.

Enter a Meſſenger.

Duke. This is his Lordſhip's man.

Prov. And here comes *Claudio's* pardon.

I wonder none of the Editors have taken notice of this inconsistency. The *Provost* has just declared a fixed opinion that the execution will not be countermanded, and yet, upon the first appearance of the Messenger, he immediately guesses that his errand is to bring *Claudio's* pardon. It is evident, I think, that the names of the Speakers are misplaced. If we suppose the *Provost* to say,

This is his Lordship's man,

it is very natural for the *Duke* to subjoin,

And here comes Claudio's pardon.

The *Duke* might believe, upon very reasonable grounds, that *Angelo* had now sent the pardon. It appears that he did so, from what he says to himself, while the *Provost* is reading the letter :

This is his pardon, purchas'd by such sin, —

In the MERCHANT OF VENICE, Act ii. Scene 10. when the Prince of *Arragon* comes to make his choice of the caskets, he repeats the substance of the oath which he had taken ; upon which *Portia* says,

To these injunctions every one doth swear,
That comes to hazard for my worthless self.

Arra-

Arragon. And so have I ADDRESS me. For-
tune now

To my heart's hope! ———

I believe we should read,

And so have I. ADDRESS me, Fortune, now
To my heart's hope!

So in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, Act iii. Scene
the last, *Falstaff* says,

——— I will then *address me* to my appoint-
ment.

In the last Scene of LOVE'S LABOUR LOST, the
Princess says,

We have receiv'd your letters, full of love;
Your favours, the embassadors of love;
And in our maiden council rated them
At courtship, pleasant jest, and courtesy,
As bombast and as lining to the time;
But more devout than these are OUR respects
Have we not BEEN, and therefore met your
loves

In their own fashion, like a merriment.

The

The sixth verse being evidently corrupted, Dr. Warburton proposes to read,

*But more devout than this (save our respects)
Have we not been ; ———*

Mr. Johnson prefers the conjecture of Sir Thomas Hanmer,

But more devout than this, in our respects ———

I would read, with less violence, I think, to the text, though with the alteration of two words,

*But more devout than these are YOUR respects
Have we not SEEN, ———*

There is a very obscure, and, I believe, corrupt passage, (of no great consequence indeed) in the TAMING OF THE SHREW, Act i. Scene 5. which Mr. Johnson has passed over in silence, notwithstanding that most extraordinary assertion in his Preface, which I shall give at the bottom of the page, in his own words*.

Hortensio having interposed to stop *Petruchio*, who was beating *Grumio*, says to the latter,

* “ Not a single passage in the whole work has appeared
“ to me corrupt, which I have not attempted to restore ;
“ or obscure, which I have not endeavoured to illustrate.”

Preface to Shakespeare, towards the end.

Rise,

Rise, *Grumio*, rise ; we will compound this quarrel.

Grumio. Nay, 'tis no matter, what HE leges in *Latin*. If this be not a lawful cause for me to leave his service, look you, Sir : ———

I cannot help suspecting that we should read,

Nay, 'tis no matter what BE leges in *Latin*, if this be not a lawful cause for me to leave his service. Look you, 'Sir. ———

That is, 'Tis no matter what is law, if this be not a lawful cause, &c.

I do not know whether I shall have any thanks for my attempt to restore this conceit, which certainly can do *Shakespeare* no honour ; but however, I will try, while I think of it, to do the same good office for another quibble, which at present is miserably lame.

IN THE SECOND PART OF HENRY THE FOURTH,
Act iv. Scene 6.

Enter Falstaff and Colevile.

Fal. What's your name, Sir ? of what condition are you ? and of what place, I pray ?

G

Cole.

Cole. I am a Knight, Sir ; and my name is *Colevile* of the dale.

Fal. Well then, *Colevile* is your name, a Knight is your degree, and your place the dale. *Colevile* shall still be your name, a traitor your degree, and the dungeon your place, a PLACE deep enough. So shall you still be *Colevile* of the dale.

But where is the wit, or the logic of this conclusion ? I am almost persuaded that we ought to read thus.

—— *Colevile* shall still be your name, a traitor your degree, and the dungeon your place, a DALE deep enough. ——

He may then justly infer,

So shall you still be *Colevile* of the dale.

I will try once more at a passage of the same kind in the MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR, Act iii. Scene 6.

Hof. Farewell, my hearts ; I will to my honest Knight *Falstaff*, and drink *Canary* with him.

Ford. [*Aside.*] I think, I shall drink IN PIPE-wine first with him : I'll make him dance.

To

To *drink in Pipe-wine* is a phrase which I cannot understand. May we not suppose that *Shakespeare* rather wrote ?

I think I shall drink HORN-PIPE wine first with him : I'll make him *dance*.

Canary is the name of a *dance*, as well as of a *wine*. *Ford* lays hold of both senses ; but, for an obvious reason, makes the dance a *Horn-pipe*. Mr. *Johnson* has thought it worth his while to remark, at the end of this Act, that *Shakespeare* has frequent allusions to a *cuckold's horns*.

IN HENRY THE FIFTH, Act iv. Scene 6. the King says,

O God of battles ! steel my Soldiers hearts ;
Possess them not with fear ; take from them now
The sense of reckoning or th' opposed numbers,
Pluck their hearts from them.

Mr. *Theobald* reads,

——— *lest* th' opposed numbers
Pluck their hearts from them.

And his alteration is admitted by Dr. *Warburton*, and approved by Mr. *Johnson*. It certainly makes

a very good sense; but, I think, we might read,
with less deviation from the present text,

—— IF th' opposed numbers
Pluck their hearts from them. ——

In conjectural Criticism, as in Mechanics, the perfection of the art, I apprehend, consists in producing a given effect with the least possible force.

The same monosyllables, I believe, have been confounded in the TWELFTH NIGHT, Act ii. Scene 2.

Viola, having discovered that *Olivia* is in love with her, makes this reflection.

- How easy is it for the proper false
In women's waxen hearts to set their forms!
Alas, our frailty is the cause, not we,
For such as we are made, IF such we be,

Mr. *Johnson* has given a strange comment, which I shall not transcribe, upon the two first lines. The sense of them, I think, is clearly this. *How easy is it for the proper false* [handsome counterfeits, beautiful outsides] *to set their forms* [to impress themselves] *in women's waxen hearts!* It cannot be necessary to prove by quotations that *proper* signifies
band-

*bandsome**; and *false* alludes to *Viola's* own case.
She had said just before,

Fortune forbid my *outside* have not charm'd her!

In the two next lines, instead of transposing them according to Mr. *Johnson's* conjecture, I am rather inclined to read the latter thus,

For such as we are made of, such we be.

IN TROILUS AND CRESSIDA, Act iii. Scene 5.

True Swains in love shall in the world to come
Approve their truths by *Troilus*; when their
rhymes,

Full of protest, of oath, and big compare,
Want similes: truth, tir'd with iteration,——

The metre, as well as the sense, of the last verse
will be improved, I think, by reading,

Want similes of truth, tir'd with iteration,——

* Take however these instances from the *As you like it*,
Act iii. Scene 11.

You are a thousand times a *properer* man,
Than she a woman. ———

And a few lines lower,

She sees herself more *proper*.

So

So, a little lower in the same speech,

Yet after all *comparisons of truth*, ———

In Act i. Scene 5. of this Play, there is a very obscure passage, which I will set down at length. It is in the beginning of the speech which *Ulysses* makes to the *Grecian* Princes in council, *Agamemnon* and *Nestor* having spoken before him.

Besides th' applause and approbation,
The which, most mighty for thy place and sway,

[to *Agamemnon*.

And thou, most reverend for thy stretch'd-out
life,

[to *Nestor*.

I give to both your speeches, (which were such
As *Agamemnon* and the hand of *Greece*

Should hold up high in *brass*; and such again

As venerable *Nestor*, HATCH'D in silver,

Should with a bond of AIR, strong as the axle-
tree

On which the heavens ride, knit all *Greeks* ears

To his experienc'd tongue) yet let it please both,

Thou great, and wise, to hear *Ulysses* speak.

In the description of *Agamemnon's* speech, there is a plain allusion to the old custom of *engraving* laws and public records in *brass*, and hanging up the
tables

tables in Temples, and other places of general resort. Our Author has the same allusion in *Measure for Measure*, Act v. Scene 1. The Duke, speaking of the merit of *Angelo* and *Escalus*, says, that

—— It deserves with characters of brass
A fortified residence, 'gainst the tooth of time
And razure of oblivion. ——

So far therefore I agree with Mr. *Johnson*. I do not see any reason for supposing, with *him*, that *Nestor's* speech, or *Nestor* himself, (for it is not clear, I think, which *he* means) was also to be *engraven in silver*. “To *hatch*,” says he, “is a term of art for a particular method of *engraving*.” It is so. *Hatching* is used in the *engraving of plates from which prints are to be taken*, principally, I believe, to express the *shadows*: but it can be of no use in any other species of *engraving*, which could *exhibit*, (to use Mr. *Johnson's* phrase) either *Nestor*, or his *speech*, in *silver*. In short, I believe, we ought to read, — THATCH'D in *silver*, alluding to his *silver hair*. The same metaphor is used by *Timon*, [Act iv. Scene 4.] to *Phryne* and *Timandra*:

—— thatch your poor thin roofs
With burthens of the dead, ——

Of the rest of this passage Mr. *Johnson* says nothing.

thing. If he has no more conception than I have,
of

——— *a bond of air, strong as the axle-tree*
On which the heavens ride ; ———

he will perhaps excuse me for hazarding a conjecture, that the true reading may possibly be,

——— *a bond of AWE.*

After all, the construction of this passage is very harsh and irregular ; but with that I meddle not, believing it was left so by the Author. Mr. *Johnson*, in his definitive sentence at the end of this Play, has pronounced it to be more *correctly* written than most of *Shakespeare's* compositions : I presume he does not mean, in point of *Style* *.

But I begin to be tired, as I am afraid the Reader has been for some time, with these disquisitions ; and therefore I will only offer two or three more corrections, which, I believe, will not be disputed ; and then conclude.

* There are more hard, bombastical phrases in the serious part of this Play, than, I believe, can be picked out of any other six Plays of *Shakespeare*. Take the following specimens, in this Scene : — *Tortive*, — *persistive*, — *protractive*, — *importless*, — *insisture*, — *deracinate*, — *dividable*. And in the next Act, — *past-proportion*, — *unrespective*, — *propugnation*, — *self-assumption*, — *self-admission*, — *assubjugate*, — *kingdom'd*, &c.

A citizen of *Angiers* [KING JOHN, Act ii. Scene 5.] speaks thus, from the walls, to the two Kings of *England* and *France*, who had summoned the town.

A greater power than we denies all this.
And, till it be undoubted, we do lock
Our former scruple in our strong barr'd gates ;
KINGS of our fears, until our fears resolv'd
Be by some certain King purg'd and depos'd.

Dr. *Warburton* saw what was requisite to make this passage sense, and Mr. *Johnson*, rather too hastily, I think, has received his emendation into the text. He reads,

Kings are our fears, ———

which he explains to mean, *our fears are the Kings which at present rule us.*

As the same sense may be obtained by a much slighter alteration, I am more inclined to read,

KING'D of our fears, ———

King'd is used as a *participle passive* by *Shakespeare* more than once, I believe. I remember one instance in *Henry the fifth*, Act ii. Scene 5. The *Dauphin* says of *England*,

H

—— She

— She is so idly *King'd*.

It is scarce necessary to add, that, *of*, here (as in numberless other places) has the signification of, *by*.

It often happens, that a comma at the end of a word is changed, by an error of the Press, into an *s*. It has happened so, I believe, in the following passage. [MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM, Act i. Scene 1.]

Lysander speaks.

You have her father's love, *Demetrius* ;
Let me have HERMIA's ; do you marry him.

I suspect that *Shakespeare* wrote,

Let me have HERMIA, do you marry him.

And again, in the opening of the TAMING OF THE SHREW, *Lucentio* says :

Pisa, renowned for grave citizens,
Gave me my being ; and my father first,
A merchant of great traffick through the world :
VINCENTIO's come of the *Bentivolii*,
Vincentio his son, brought up in *Florence*,
It shall become, &c.

This

This passage, I think, should be read and pointed thus.

Pisa, renowned for grave citizens,
Gave me my being, and my father first,
A merchant of great traffick through the world,
VINCENTIO, come of the *Bentivolii*.

In the next line, which should begin a new sentence, *Vincentio his son*, is the same as *Vincentio's son*, which the Author of *the Revisal* not apprehending, has proposed to alter *Vincentio* into *Lucentio*.

I did not mean to have taken notice, in these Observations, of any errors arising from a false punctuation only; but I find it necessary to interpose in behalf of one very fine passage, in my opinion, which is in danger of being turned out of the text; for no other reason, as I conceive, than because a wrong pointing has made it obscure and unintelligible. This, I suppose, induced the Players to leave out part of it, and to mangle the rest, in their Edition; and Mr. *Johnson* has followed their example, possibly upon no better grounds. The passage is in *LEAR*, Act i. Scene 14. I will set it down at length.

Does any here know me? This is not *Lear*.

Does

Does *Lear* walk thus? speak thus? where are his eyes?

Either his notion weakens, his discernings
Are lethargied—— Ha! waking? —'tis not so.
Who is it that can tell me who I am?
Lear's shadow? I would learn; for by the marks
Of sovereignty, of knowledge and of reason,
I should be false persuaded I had daughters.
Your name, fair Gentlewoman! ——

The difficulty, which must occur to every Reader, is, to conceive how *the marks of sovereignty, of knowledge and of reason*, should be of any use to *persuade Lear that he had*, or had not, Daughters. No Logic, I apprehend, could draw such a conclusion from such premisses. This difficulty, however, may be entirely removed, by only pointing the passage thus.

————— for by the marks
Of sovereignty, of knowledge, and of reason,
I should be false persuaded.— I had daughters.—
Your name, fair Gentlewoman? ——

The chain of *Lear's* speech being thus untangled, we can clearly trace the succession and connection of his Ideas. The undutiful behaviour of his daughter so disconcerts him, that he doubts, by
turns,

turns, whether she is *Gonerill*, and whether he himself is *Lear*. Upon her first speech, he only exclaims,

————— *Are you our daughter ?*

Upon her going on in the same style, he begins to question his own sanity of mind, and even his personal identity. He appeals to the By-standers.

Who is it that can tell me who I am ? ———

I should be glad to be told. For [if I was to judge myself] *by the marks of sovereignty, of knowledge, and of reason*, [which once distinguish'd *Lear*, but which I have now lost,] *I should be false* [against my own consciousness] *persuaded* [that I am not *Lear*.] He then slides to the examination of another distinguishing mark of *Lear* :

————— *I had daughters.*

But not able, as it should seem, to dwell upon so tender a subject, he hastily recurs to his first doubt concerning *Gonerill*, ———

Your name, fair Gentlewoman ?

Instead of these natural workings of high tragical passion, it may be worth the while to see what Mr. *Johnson* has given us from the Players Edition.

The

The first four lines are the same. He then goes on thus.

Who is it that can tell me who I am?

Fool. Lear's shadow.

Lear. Your name, fair Gentlewoman?

ALAS, POOR SHAKESPEARE!

oes